

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 6, 8 and 9 are independent. In light of the amendments and remarks contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 to more appropriately recite the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that these amendments are being made without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to timely advance prosecution of the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Pogue et al.* (USP 6,112,240). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The disclosure of *Pogue et al.* is directed to a website client information tracker. *Pogue et al.* identifies known access counters of a specific web server and identifies it's main problem to be solved being to avoid failing to account for re-access to web pages after the web pages have been downloaded into the cache memory in the client computer (column 1, lines 54-67). In order to solve this problem, *Pogue et al.* provides for obtaining client information relating to a web pages in a world wide website utilizing a tracker tag in the code of the web page for initiating the client information tracking program. As disclosed in Figure 3, one tracking computer is provided to each web server. In other words, N web servers need N tracking computers respectively to count the number of accesses to each web server. This is disclosed in the first through third implementations of *Pogue et al.*

In the second implementation of *Pogue et al.*, tracker 310 obtains information on the last web page that the specific client computer visited by means of the last cookie previously transmitted from the tracker to the browser 302, and not the present web page (column 6, line 46 - column 7, line 22). As such, tracker 310 does not count the present access to the web page because the new cookie sent to the client computer at the time of the present access does not send

back any information to the tracker computer. In other words, the tracker of *Pogue et al.* does not necessarily count the up to date exact number of visitors to the website. The tracker appears to count only the number of accesses to the corresponding specific web server as shown in Figure 3.

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, an information collecting system including means for inserting an information collecting instruction script to information of the web server of the information provider provided by itself, the information collecting instruction script being configured to work in a browser program of the client, licensed by the information collector to the information provider and including an identifier inherent to each said information provider. As such, one information collecting server can accumulate information on how many times each information provider server has been accessed based on the identifier. The information collecting instruction script, which is inserted to information of the information provider server, and includes the identifier, works in a browser program of the client and issues the identifier and instructions to information collector server to activate the information collecting program.

Based upon the discussion of *Pogue et al.* noted above, *Pogue et al.* fails to teach or suggest this identifier of the present invention which is licensed by the information collector to the information provider. As *Pogue et al.* fails to teach or suggest all the elements as set forth in claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Pogue et al.* It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-4 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1, at least based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 5, 6, and 8 include elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus these claims, together with claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by *Pogue et al.*

With regard to the Examiner's rejection of claim 9, based upon the disclosure of *Pogue et al.* noted above with regard to claim 1, Applicant maintains that *Pogue et al.* fails to teach or suggest means for storing, when the client accesses to the information providing server and views information, viewing information of the client transmitted in accordance with the information collecting instruction script. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9, together with claims dependent thereon, are not anticipated by *Pogue et al.* and it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 10/009,807  
Amendment dated November 10, 2005  
After Final Office Action of August 10, 2005

Docket No.: 0033-0780P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: November 10, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By

Terrell C. Birch

Registration No.: 19,382

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP  
8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant